arXiv:0908.3353v1 [math.AP] 24 Aug 2009

On the one fluid limit for vortex sheets

Fabio Pusateri

Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences
New York University
251 Mercer Street, New York, N.Y. 10012 (USA)
pusateri@cims.nyu.edu

Abstract

We consider the interface problem between two incompressible and inviscid fluids with constant densities in the presence of surface tension. Following the geometric approach of [14, 15] we show that solutions to this problem converge to solutions of the free–boundary Euler equations in vacuum as one of the densities goes to zero.

1 Introduction

1.1 Description of the problem and main results

We consider the interface problem between two incompressible and inviscid fluids that occupy domains Ω_t^+ and Ω_t^- in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) at time t. We assume Ω_0^+ is compact and $\mathbb{R}^n = \Omega_t^+ \cup \Omega_t^- \cup S_t$ where $S_t := \partial\Omega_t^\pm$. We let $v_\pm$, $p_\pm$ and $\rho_\pm > 0$ denote respectively the velocity, the pressure and the constant density of the fluid occupying the region $\Omega_t^\pm$. We assume the presence of surface tension on the interface which is argued on physical basis to be proportional to the mean curvature κ_+ of the hypersurface S_t. The equations of motion are given by[1]

$$\begin{cases} \rho(v_t + v \cdot \nabla v) = -\nabla p & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t \\ \nabla \cdot v = 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t \\ v(0,x) = v^0(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0 \end{cases} \tag{E}$$

with corresponding boundary conditions for the interface evolution and pressure's jump given by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t + v_\pm \cdot \nabla \text{ is tangent to } \bigcup_t S_t \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \\ p_+(t,x) - p_-(t,x) = \epsilon^2 \kappa_+(t,x) \ , \ \ x \in S_t \, . \end{cases} \tag{BC}$$

We are interested in analyzing the asymptotic behavior of solutions of the above equations when $\rho_- \to 0$. Our result is convergence to the solution (v_+, S_t^∞) of the free–boundary problem for Euler equations

$$\begin{cases} \rho_+(\partial_t v_+ + v_+ \cdot \nabla v_+) = -\nabla p_+ & x \in \Omega_t^\infty \\ \nabla \cdot v_+ = 0 & x \in \Omega_t^\infty \\ v_+(0,x) = v_+^0(x) & x \in \Omega_0^+ \end{cases} \tag{E_0}$$

with corresponding boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t + v_+ \cdot \nabla \text{ is tangent to } \bigcup_t S_t^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \\ p_+(t,x) = \epsilon^2 \kappa^\infty(t,x) \ , \ \ x \in S_t^\infty \end{cases} \tag{BC_0}$$

where κ^∞ denotes the mean curvature of $S_t^\infty := \partial\Omega_t^\infty$. More precisely we will show the following

[1] Here we are introducing the notation $f = f_+ \chi_{\Omega_t^+} + f_- \chi_{\Omega_t^-}$ for any $f_\pm$ defined on $\Omega_t^\pm$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let an initial hypersurface*[2] $S_0 \in H^{l+1}$ *and an initial velocity field* $v_0 \in H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0)$ *be given for some* $l > \frac{n}{2} + 2$. *Consider any sequence of local in time solutions of (E)–(BC)*

$$S_t^m \in C([0,T], H^{l+1}) \quad , \quad v^m \in C([0,T], H^l(\Omega_t^m))$$

corresponding to values of the density $\rho^m = \rho_+ \chi_{\Omega_t^+} + \rho_-^m \chi_{\Omega_t^-}$ *with* $\rho_-^m \to 0$ *as* $m \to \infty$. *Then* (v_+^m, S_t^m) *converge*[3] *on a small time interval to the solution*

$$S_t = \partial\Omega_t^\infty \in C(H^{l'+1}) \quad , \quad v_+ \in C(H^{l'}(\Omega_t^\infty)) \quad \textit{for any } l' < l$$

of (E_0)*–*(BC_0). *Convergence is in the space* $(S_t, v) \in L^\infty(H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}) \times L^\infty(H^{l'})$ *for any* $l' < l$.

Free–boundary problems for Euler equations have been extensively studied in recent years following the breakthrough of Wu in [18, 19] where local well–posedness in Sobolev spaces is proved in 2 and 3 dimensions for the irrotational gravity water wave problem. Many works have dealt with the water wave problem also in the general non–zero curl case, see for instance [13, 8, 14, 9].
For the irrotational vortex sheet problem with surface tension Ambrose [1] and more recently Ambrose and Masmoudi [2] proved well–posedness respectively in 2 and 3 dimensions. Cheng, Coutand and Shkoller [6] proved well–posedness in 3–d for the full problem with rotation and well–posedness is also obtained (in any dimension) by Shatah and Zeng [16] for (E)–(BC) and other realted fluid surface problems [16, sec. 6].
In absence of surface tension the vortex sheet problem for the free–boundary motion of two fluids is ill–posed due to the Kelvin–Helmotz instability as shown in [11]. Beale, Hou and Lowengrub [4] showed how the surface tension regularizes the linearized problem. In the next section we will show how the Kelvin–Helmotz instability is very apparent from the infinite–dimensional geometric arguments presented by Shatah and Zeng in [15].
We recall that also the free–boundary problem for Euler equations in vacuum (E_0)–(BC_0) with $\epsilon = 0$ is known to be ill–posed due to Rayleigh–Taylor instability, see [10], which occurs if one does not assume the sign condition

$$-\nabla_{N_+} p_+(x,t) \geq a > 0 \ . \tag{RT}$$

In [14] it is shown how also the Rayleigh–Taylor instability is a natural consequence of a geometric calculation and is related to the sign of an operator appearing in the linearization of the Euler flow. Motivated by this we are going to show

Proposition 1.2. *Let* Γ *be the space of all admissible Lagrangian maps for the interface problem* (E)–(BC) *defined in* (1.7) *and let*

$$\Gamma^\star := \left\{ \Phi : \Omega_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n \text{ volume–preserving homeomorphisms} \right\}$$

be the corresponding space for the water wave problem (E_0)–(BC_0). *Consider a point* $u \in \Gamma$ *and tangent vectors* $v_i \in T_u\Gamma$ *for* $i = 1 \dots 4$, *where* $T_u\Gamma$ *is endowed with the* $L^2(\rho^m dx)$ *metric. If we denote*[4] $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ *and* $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^\star$ *the curvature tensors of* Γ *and* $\Gamma^\star$ *respectively, then*

$$\langle \bar{\mathcal{R}}(u)(v_1,v_2)v_3, v_4 \rangle_{L^2(\rho^m dy)} \overset{m\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \langle \bar{\mathcal{R}}^\star(u_+)(v_{1+},v_{2+})v_{3+}, v_{4+} \rangle_{L^2(\rho_+ dy)} \tag{1.1}$$

In view of the geometric frame work described below and the linearized equation (1.17), proposition 1.2 can be considered as a first step in showing that solutions of (E)–(BC) converge to solutions of (E_0)–(BC_0) with $\epsilon = 0$ when $\epsilon, \rho_- \to 0$ at the same time[5].

Our paper is organized as follows. The geometry of Γ is presented in section 1.2 and an explanation of the geometric intuition behind the Kelvin–Helmotz and Raileigh–Taylor instabilities is given in 1.2.3. Of course we refer to [14, 15] for full details about this general geometric approach. In section 2 we state theorems on energy estimates which are independent of ρ_-. Proofs are performed in section 3 and appendix B. Section 4 is devoted to showing strong convergence of solutions as stated in theorem 1.1. The proof of proposition 1.2 is then performed in section 5.

During the writing of this manuscript it was brought to the attention of the author that Cheng, Coutand and Shkoller [7] had proved an analogous result to the one stated in theorem 1.1.

1.2 The geometric approach to Euler equations

It is well–known that the interface problem between two fluids has a variational formulation on a subspace of the space of volume–preserving homeomorphisms. For the water wave problem this was observed for the first time by Arnold in his seminal paper [3], where he pointed out that Euler equations for the motion of an inviscid and incompressible fluid can be viewed as the geodesic flow on the infinite–dimensional manifold of volume–preserving diffeomorphisms. This point of view has been adopted by several authors in works such as [17, 5, 12] and more recently by Shatah and Zeng in [14, 15, 16].

[2] The regularity of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is intended in the sense of local coordinates: an hypersurface is H^s for $s > \frac{n}{2}$ if it can be locally represented as the graph of H^s–functions.

[3] Convergence is achieved by reducing the problem to the fixed initial domain Ω_0 using Lagrangian coordinate maps. See section 4 for details.

[4] Covariant differentiation on $T_u\Gamma$ (and on $T_u\Gamma^\star$) is defined in section 1.2.2.

[5] We believe that some condition of the form $\rho_- = O(\epsilon^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ should be needed in this case.

1.2.1 Lagrangian formulation

The surface tension parameter ϵ will be henceforth set to be one. Multiplying (E) by v, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t$, using the boundary condition (BC) and the variation of surface area formula, we obtain the conserved energy[6]

$$E = E_0(S_t, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} \frac{\rho |v|^2}{2}\, dx + \int_{S_t} dS =: \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} \frac{\rho |v|^2}{2}\, dx + S(S_t)\,. \tag{1.2}$$

For $y \in \Omega_0^{\pm}$ we define $u_{\pm}(t,y)$ to be the Lagrangian coordinate map associated to the velocity field $v_{\pm}$, i.e the solution of the ODE

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = v_{\pm}(t,x) \quad , \quad x(0,y) = y \qquad \forall\ y \in \Omega_0^{\pm}\,; \tag{1.3}$$

for any vector field w on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t$ we define its material derivative by

$$\mathbf{D}_t w := w_t + v \cdot \nabla w = (w \circ u)_t \circ u^{-1}\,.$$

In [15, sec. 2] the authors derive from (E)–(BC) the following equation for the physical pressure:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta p &= \rho\, \mathrm{tr}\,(Dv^2) \\ p_{\pm}|_{S_t} &= \mathcal{N}^{-1}\Big\{ -\frac{1}{\rho_{\mp}} \mathcal{N}_{\mp}\kappa_{\mp} - 2\nabla_{v_+^{\top} - v_-^{\top}} v_+^{\perp} - \Pi_+(v_+^{\top}, v_+^{\top}) - \Pi_-(v_-^{\top}, v_-^{\top}) \\ & \qquad -\nabla_{N_+}\Delta_+^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(Dv^2) - \nabla_{N_-}\Delta_-^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(Dv^2)\Big\} \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

where $\Pi_{\pm}$ denotes the second fundamental form of the hypersurface S_t (with respect to the outward unit normal vector $N_{\pm}$ relative to the domain $\Omega_t^{\pm}$) and $\mathcal{N}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{N} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_+}{\rho_+} + \frac{\mathcal{N}_-}{\rho_-} \tag{1.5}$$

with $\mathcal{N}_{\pm}$ denoting the Dirichlet–to–Neumann operator on the domain $\Omega_t^{\pm}$.
From (1.3) we see that in Lagrangian coordinates Euler equations assume the form

$$\rho u_{tt} = -\nabla p \circ u \qquad u(0) = \mathrm{id}_{\,\Omega_0} \tag{1.6}$$

with p determined by (1.4).
Since v is divergence free, $u_{\pm}$ are volume–preserving maps on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0$. Moreover $u_+(t,S_0) = u_-(t,S_0)$ even if the restriction to S_0 of u_+ and u_- do not coincide in general. This leads to the definition of the space Γ of admissible Lagrangian maps for the interface problem:

$$\Gamma \;=\; \Big\{ \Phi = \Phi_+ \chi_{\Omega_0^+} + \Phi_- \chi_{\Omega_0^-} \;:\; \Phi_{\pm} : \Omega_0^{\pm} \to \Phi_{\pm}(\Omega_0^{\pm}) \text{ is volume–preserving homeo. and } \partial\Phi_{\pm}(\Omega_0^{\pm}) = \Phi_{\pm}(\partial\Omega_0^{\pm}) \Big\}\,.$$

Denoting $S(\Phi) = \int_{\Phi(S_0)} dS$ we can rewrite the energy (1.2) in Lagrangian coordinates as

$$E_0(u, u_t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0} \frac{\bar{\rho} |u_t|^2}{2}\, dy + S(u)$$

where $\bar{\rho} = \rho \circ u$. The conservation of the above energy suggests that (E)–(BC) has a Lagrangian action

$$I(u) = \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0} \frac{\bar{\rho} |u_t|^2}{2}\, dy\, dt \;-\; \int S(u)\, dt\,. \tag{1.7}$$

[6]Notice that the conserved energy does not control the L^2 norm of v_- in the asymptotic regime $\rho_- \to 0$.

1.2.2 The geometry of Γ

To derive the Euler–Lagrange equations associated to the action I one has to look at the geometry of Γ considered as a submanifold of $L^2(\bar\rho dy)$ and identify its tangent and normal spaces. It is easy to see that the tangent space of Γ at the point Φ is given by divergence–free vector fields with matching normal components in Eulerian coordinates[7]

$$T_\Phi\Gamma = \left\{ \bar w : \mathbb{R}^n \smallsetminus S_0 \to \mathbb{R}^n \ : \nabla\cdot w = 0 \ \text{ and } \ w_+^\perp + w_-^\perp\big|_{\Phi(S_0)} = 0\,, \ \text{where } w = \bar w\circ\Phi^{-1} \right\}.$$

while the normal space is

$$(T_\Phi\Gamma)^\perp = \left\{ -(\nabla\psi)\circ\Phi \ : \ \rho_+\psi_+\,\big|_{\Phi(S_0)} \ = \ \rho_-\psi_-\big|_{\Phi(S_0)} =: \psi^S \right\}. \tag{1.8}$$

A critical path $u(t,\cdot)$ of I satisfies

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t u_t + S'(u) = 0 \tag{1.9}$$

where $S'(u)$ denotes the tangential gradient of $S(u)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t$ is the covariant derivative on Γ (along $u(t)$). In order to verify that the Lagrangian map associated to a solution of (E)–(BC) is indeed a critical path of (1.7) we need to compute S' and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t$.
Computing $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t$ and $II_{u(t)}$: Given a path $u(t,\cdot)\in\Gamma$ denote $\bar v = u_t$ and $S_t = u(t,S_0)$. For any $\bar w(t,\cdot)\in T_u\Gamma$ we must have

$$\bar w_t = \bar{\mathcal{D}}_t\bar w + II_{u(t)}(\bar w,\bar v) \tag{1.10}$$

where $II_{u(t)}(\bar w,\bar v)\in (T_{u(t)}\Gamma)^\perp$ denotes the second fundamental form on $T_{u(t)}\Gamma$. From (1.8) there exists a unique scalar function $p_{v,w}$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t$ such that

$$II_{u(t)}(\bar w,\bar v) = -\nabla p_{v,w}\circ u \in \big(T_{u(t)}\Gamma\big)^\perp \tag{1.11}$$

In [15] it is shown that $p_{v,w}$ is given by[8]

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} -\Delta p_{v,w} & = & \operatorname{tr}(Dv Dw) \\ \\ p_{v,w}^\pm\big|_{S_t} & = & \frac{1}{\rho_\pm} p^S_{v,w} = -\frac{1}{\rho_\pm}\mathcal{N}^{-1}\Big\{ \nabla_{v_+^\top - v_-^\top} w_+^\perp + \nabla_{w_+^\top - w_-^\top} v_+^\perp - \Pi_+(v_+^\top, w_+^\top) \\ \\ & & -\Pi_-(v_-^\top, w_-^\top) - \nabla_{N_+}\Delta_+^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv Dw) - \nabla_{N_-}\Delta_-^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv Dw)\Big\}\,. \end{array}\right. \tag{1.13}$$

Then in Eulerian coordinates we can write

$$\mathcal{D}_t w := (\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t\bar w)\circ u^{-1} = \mathbf{D}_t w + \nabla p_{v,w}\,. \tag{1.14}$$

Computing $S'(u)$: For any $\bar w\in T_u\Gamma$ the formula for the variation of surface area gives

$$\langle S'(u),\bar w\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_0,\rho dy)} = \int_{S_t}\kappa_+ w_+^\perp\, dS$$

and it is not hard to verify that the unique representation in Eulerian coordinates of $S'(u)$ as a functional acting on $T_u\Gamma$ is

$$S'(u) = \nabla p_k \qquad \text{with} \qquad p_k^\pm = \frac{1}{\rho_-\rho_+}\mathcal{H}_\pm\mathcal{N}^{-1}\mathcal{N}_\mp\kappa_\mp\,. \tag{1.15}$$

From (1.4), (1.13) and (1.15) we obtain the identity $p = \rho(p_k + p_{v,v})$. Therefore, taking $\bar w = u_t$, we see from (1.14) and (1.15) that a solution of (1.9) equivalently satisfies

$$\mathbf{D}_t v + \nabla p_{v,v} + \nabla p_\kappa = 0 \tag{1.16}$$

which is exactly (1.6) in Eulerian coordinates.

---

[7] We follow the convention used in [15] where the Lagrangian description of any vector field $X:\Phi(\Omega_0)\to\mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $\bar X = X\circ\Phi$.

[8] Let us point out that in the water wave problem with just one fluid in vacuum we have $II^\star_{u(t)}(\bar w,\bar v) = -\nabla p^\star_{v,w}\circ u\in\big(T_{u(t)}\Gamma^\star\big)^\perp$ with

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} -\Delta p^\star_{v,w} & = & \operatorname{tr}(Dv Dw) \\ p^\star_{v,w}\big|_{\partial\Omega_t} & = & 0\,. \end{array}\right. \tag{1.12}$$

1.2.3 Linearized equation and instability

The Lagrangian formulation discussed above provides a convenient setting to study the linearization of the problem. Considering variations around the solution u_t of (1.9) and taking a covariant derivative with respect to the variation parameter, we obtain the following linearization for $\bar{w}(t,\cdot) \in T_{u(t)}\Gamma$:

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_t^2 \bar{w} + \bar{\mathcal{R}}(u)(\bar{u_t}, \bar{w})u_t + \bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 S(u)\bar{w} = 0 \tag{1.17}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ denotes the curvature tensor of the manifold Γ and $\mathcal{D}^2 S(u)$ is the projection on $T_{u(t)}\Gamma$ of the second variation of the surface area. Both of these linear operators acting on $T_u\Gamma$ play a central role in the understanding of the problem and in the definition of high–order energies based on their leading order terms. In [14] an explicit but rather complicated formula is given for $\mathcal{D}^2 S(u)$; in [14, 15] its leading order term $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ is singled out and turns out to be given[9] in Eulerian coordinates by

$$\mathcal{A}(u)(w) = \nabla f_+ \chi_{\Omega^+} + \nabla f_- \chi_{\Omega^-} \quad \text{with} \quad f_\pm = \frac{1}{\rho_+ \rho_-} \mathcal{H}_\pm \mathcal{N}^{-1} \mathcal{N}_\mp (-\Delta_{S_t}) w_\pm^\perp \,; \tag{1.18}$$

it is easy to see that $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ is a third–order[10] self–adjoint and positive semi–definite operator with $\bar{\mathcal{A}}(u)(\bar{w},\bar{w}) = |\nabla w_\pm^\perp|^2_{L^2(S_t)}$. Further computations performed in [15, pp 859 - 860], show that the leading–order term $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_0(u)(\bar{v})$ of the unbounded sectional curvature operator $\bar{\mathcal{R}}(u)(\bar{v},\cdot)\bar{v}$ is given in Eulerian coordinates by

$$\mathcal{R}_0(u)(w) = \nabla f_+ \chi_{\Omega^+} + \nabla f_- \chi_{\Omega^-} \quad \text{with} \quad f_\pm = \frac{1}{\rho_+ \rho_-} \mathcal{H}_\pm \mathcal{N}^{-1} \mathcal{N}_\mp \nabla_{v_+^\top - v_-^\top} \mathcal{N}^{-1} \mathcal{D} \cdot \left(w_\pm^\perp (v_+^\top - v_-^\top) \right) .$$

Noticing that $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_0(u)$ is a second–order negative semidefinite differential operator we immediately see that the linearized Euler equations would be ill–posed if there had been no surface tension generating the operator $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$. This is the so–called *Kelvin–Helmotz instability* for the two fluids interface problem.

We conclude this section recalling that the same geometric setting described above applies to the problem of Euler equations in vacuum. The same Lagrangian approach is of course available and the linearized equation is still given by (1.17). Computations performed in [14, sec 2.2] show how the leading order term of the differential operators involved in the linearization are given by $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_0^\star(u)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}^\star(u)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{R}}(\bar{v},\bar{w}) &= \bar{\mathcal{R}}_0^\star(u) + \text{ bounded operators} \\ \bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 S(u) &= \bar{\mathcal{A}}^\star(u) + \text{ second–order differential operators} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}}_0^\star(u) = \int_{S_t} -\nabla_N p_{v,v}^\star \left|\nabla w^\perp\right|^2 \rho_+ dS \quad , \qquad \bar{\mathcal{A}}^\star(u) = \int_{S_t} \left|\nabla w^\perp\right|^2 \rho_+ dS \,. \tag{1.19}$$

Since also in this case $\bar{\mathcal{A}}^\star(u)$ is generated by the presence of surface–tension, we see that (1.17) is ill-posed in absence of surface tension if the *Raileigh–Taylor sign condition* (RT) is not assumed.

2 Theorems on Energy Estimates

Definition 2.1. *Let $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(S_0, l - \frac{1}{2}, \delta, L)$ for some $l > \frac{n}{2} + 1$, $L > 0$ and $0 < \delta \ll 1$ be the collection of all hypersurfaces $\tilde{S}$ such that a diffeomorphism $F : S_0 \to \tilde{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ exists with*

$$|F - \mathit{id}_{S_0}|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(S_0)} < \delta$$

and satisfying a uniform bound on the mean curvature $|\kappa|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(\tilde{S})} < L$.

In [15] the geometric considerations exposed in section 1.2 led the authors to define the following energy for (E)–(BC)

[9] Both in the one fluid case and the interface problem the leading order term of $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 S(u)$ has the same form but its Hilbert space representation does not coincide due to the different orthogonal splitting of L^2 in $T_\Phi\Gamma$ and $(T_\Phi\Gamma)^\perp$ in the two settings. We refer to [15, pp. 857-858] for the details of the derivation of $\mathcal{A}$.

[10] Assuming S_t is smooth enough.

Definition 2.2. *Consider domains $\Omega_t^{\pm}$ with Ω_t^+ compact and interface $S_t \in H^{l+1}$. Let $v(t,\cdot) \in H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)$ be any divergence–free vector field with $v_+^\perp + v_-^\perp = 0$, define the energy*

$$E(S_t, v(t,\cdot)) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} |\mathcal{A}^{\frac{l}{3}} v|^2 \rho\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} |\mathcal{A}^{\frac{l}{3}-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla p_\kappa|^2 \rho\, dx + |\omega|^2_{H^{l-1}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)} \tag{2.1}$$

where ω is the curl of v, that is $\omega_i^j = \partial_i v^j - \partial_j v^i$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $l > \frac{n}{2} + 1$, then for $S_t \in \Lambda_0$ with $S_t \in H^{l+1}$ we have*

$$|\kappa|^2_{H^{l-1}(S)} \le C_0(1+E) \quad , \qquad |v|^2_{H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S)} \le C_0(1+E+E_0)^2$$

where C_0 is some positive constant depending only on Λ_0 and the initial data (in particular it is independent of ρ_-).

The above proposition is the equivalent of [15, proposition 4.1]. The proof of bounds which are independent of the density ρ_- just requires some small modification of the argument given in [15].See section 3.

Theorem 2.4 (Energy Estimates for (E) and (BC), [15]). *Let $l > \frac{n}{2} + 1$ and a solution to (E)–(BC) be given by*

$$S_t \in H^{l+1} \quad \text{and} \quad v \in C_t^0\left(H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)\right) ,$$

then there exists $L > 0$ and a positive time $t^\star$ independent of ρ_- and depending only on $|v(0,\cdot)|_{H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)}$, Λ_0 and L, such that $S_t \in \Lambda_0$ and $|\kappa|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} \le L$ for all $0 \le t \le t^\star$. Moreover the following energy estimate holds for $0 \le t \le t^\star$:

$$E(S_t, v(t,\cdot)) \le 3E(S_0, v(0,\cdot)) + C_1 + \int_0^t P(E_0, E(S_{t'}, v(t',\cdot)))\, dt' \tag{2.2}$$

where P is a polynomial with positive coefficients determined only by Λ_0 and the constant C_1 depends only on $|v_0|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0)}$ and Λ_0.

The proof of theorem 2.4 is essentially the same as in [15] and is postponed to the appendix.

Corollary 2.5. *Consider a sequence of solutions*

$$S_t^m \in C^0\left(H^{l+1}\right) \quad , \quad v^m \in C^0\left(H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t^m)\right)$$

solving locally in time the Euler system (E)–(BC) *for values of the density $\rho_-^m \to 0$. If we denote*

$$E_m(t) := E\left(S_t^m, v^m(t,\cdot)\right)$$

with E given by (2.1)*, then there exists a positive time $t_0^\star$ and a constant C depending only on the set Λ_0, $|v_0|_{H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0)}$ and $|v_0|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0)}$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t_0^\star]} E_m(t) \le 2E(0) + 2C_1 \quad , \qquad \forall\ m \in \mathbb{N}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

The above corollary gives as a consequence weak convergence of solutions of the vortex sheet problem to solutions of the one fluid problem in vacuum. Standard compactness arguments are going to give the strong convergence stated in theorem 1.1. See section 4 for details.
For completeness we state here a theorem, proved in [16], based on the above energy estimates and concerning existence of solutions:

Theorem 2.6 (Well–posedness for (E)–(BC), [16]). *Given an initial surface $S_0 \in H^{l+1}$ and initial velocity $v_0 \in H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_0)$ with $l > \frac{n}{2} + 1$, the free interface problem (E)–(BC) has a solution in the space*

$$S_t \in C^0\left(H^{l+1}\right) \quad , \qquad v \in C^0\left(H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)\right)$$

for t in some small interval $[0, T]$ independent of the density ρ_-. Moreover, if $l > 3$ the problem is locally well–posed, i.e. the solution is unique and depends continuously on the initial data.

3 Proof of Proposition 2.3

Using the definition of $\mathfrak{a}$ in (1.18) we can explicitly write the terms appearing in the energy (2.1) as in (B.2), (B.3) and (B.4) with $k/2$ replaced by $l/3$. From the properties of $\mathcal{N}_\pm$ and $\mathcal{N}^{-1}$ in lemma A.2 it follows that there exists a constant C independent of ρ_- such that

$$|\kappa|^2_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} \leq C(1+E) \quad , \quad |v^\perp_\pm|^2_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(S_t)} \leq C(1+E)\,.$$

To estimate v we proceed in three simple steps:

1) Estimates on the Lagrangian coordinate map: Consider the Lagrangian map u_- associated to v_-. From lemma A.1 we get

$$|u_-(t,\cdot) - \text{ id}\,|_{H^s(\Omega_0^-)} \leq C_1 \int_0^t |v_-(s,\cdot)|_{H^s(\Omega_t^-)} |u_-(s,\cdot)|^s_{H^s(\Omega_0^-)}\, ds$$

for any $0 \leq s \leq l$ where $C_1 > 0$ only depends on n and l. Now, let μ be a sufficiently large number to be specified later depending only on the H^l–norm of the initial velocity, define

$$t_0 := \sup\left\{ t \,:\, |v(t',\cdot)|_{H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \smallsetminus S_{t'})} \leq \mu \;\; \forall \;\; t' \in [0,t] \right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Since v is assumed to be continuous in time with values in H^l, $t_0 > 0$. The previous inequality and an easy bootstrap argument (or Gronwall's inequality) show that there exists a positive time t_1^- and a constant C_2 depending only on l, n,μ and Λ_0 such that

$$|u_-(t,\cdot) - \text{ id}_{\Omega_0^-}|_{H^l(\Omega_0^-)} \leq C_2 t \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad , \quad \forall \;\; t \in [0, t^\star] \tag{3.2}$$

for $t^\star := \min\{t_0, t_1^-, 1/(2C_2)\}$. This shows that u_- is an H^l–diffeomorphism so that $u_-^{-1}(t,\cdot)$ is a well–defined volume preserving map for $x \in \Omega_t^-$ and for the same range of times we have

$$|(Du_-)^{-1}|_{H^s(\Omega_0^-)} \leq 2 \quad , \quad \forall \;\; 0 \leq s \leq l-1.$$

2) Decomposition of vector fields and control of the lower norm: As it is well-known (and explained in detail in [14, Appendix B]) any divergence–free vector field $v : \mathbb{R}^n \smallsetminus S_t \to \mathbb{R}^n$ obeying the condition $v^\perp_+ + v^\perp_- = 0$ can be decomposed into two divergence–free components, the rotational part v_r responsible for the interior motion and an irrotational or gradient component $v_{ir} = \nabla g$ responsible for the motion of the boundary S_t. More precisely g is the solution of the elliptic Neumann problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta g = 0 & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \smallsetminus S_t \\ \nabla_{N_\pm} g_\pm = v^\perp_\pm & x \in S_t \end{cases}$$

and $v_r := v - v_{ir}$. It is observed in [16] that the invariance of Euler equations under the action of the group of volume preserving diffeomorphisms leads, via Noether's theorem, to a family of conserved quantities which determine the rotational part of the velocity

$$v_r(t,\cdot) = P_r\left(S_t, (Du^{-1})^\star v(0, u^{-1}(t,\cdot))\right) \tag{3.3}$$

where $P_r(S_t, X)$ denotes the projection of $X : \mathbb{R}^n \smallsetminus S_t \to \mathbb{R}^n$ onto its rotational (gradient–free) part. Therefore we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |v_-(t,\cdot)|_{L^2(\Omega_t^-)} &\leq |v_r|_{L^2(\Omega_t^-)} + |v_{ir}(t,\cdot)|_{L^2(\Omega_t^-)} \leq |(Du^{-1})^\star v(0, u^{-1}(t,\cdot)|_{L^2(\Omega_t^-)} + |v^\perp_-(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(S_t)} \\ &\leq |(Du)^{-1}|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0^-)} |v(0,\cdot)|_{L^2(\Omega_0^-)} + CE^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(1+E^{\frac{1}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

with C depending only on the initial data and Λ_0.

3) Control of $|v|_{H^l}$: To conclude we use the fact[11] that any divergence–free vector field can be controlled by its curl and normal component:

$$|v|^2_{H^l(\Omega_t^\pm)} \leq C(1+|\kappa_+|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(S_t)})^2 \left(|\operatorname{curl} v|^2_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t^\pm)} + |v^\perp_+|^2_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(S_t)} + |v|^2_{L^2(\Omega_t^\pm)} \right) \leq C(1+E+E_0)^2$$

where the constant C depends only on the initial data and the set Λ_0 □

[11] A more general statement is

$$|v_\pm|_{H^l(\Omega_\pm)} \leq C(1+|\kappa_+|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(S)}) \left(|\operatorname{div} v_\pm|_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_\pm)} + |\operatorname{curl} v_\pm|_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_\pm)} + |v^\perp_\pm - \nabla\Delta^{-1} \operatorname{div} v_\pm|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(S)} + |v_\pm|_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)} \right)$$

where the constant C depends only on Λ_0. An essential proof of this can be found in [14, proposition 4.3].

4 Proof Theorem 1.1

In this section we are going to use the uniform bounds provided by corollary 2.5 combined with the non–linear Eulerian frame work introduced in [14] to obtain the strong convergence of solutions stated in theorem 1.1.

4.1 Convergence of Lagrangian maps and velocity fields

As a first step we need to estimate the physical pressure.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $v \in H^l$ and $S_t = \partial\Omega_t \in H^{l+1}$ with $l > \frac{n}{2} + 2$ be a given solution of* (E)–(BC)*. Then the pressure p, determined by* (1.4)*, satisfies*

$$|p_+|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} \leq C\left(|v_+|^2_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t^+)} + |\kappa_+|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} + \rho_-|v|^2_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)}|N|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)}\right) \tag{4.1}$$

and for $\rho_- \ll 1$

$$|p_-|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t^-)} \leq C\rho_-\left(|v_-|^2_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t^-)} + |\kappa_-|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} + |v|^2_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)}|N|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)}\right) \tag{4.2}$$

for some constant C depending only on the set of hypersurfaces Λ_0.

Proof Write $p_\pm = \Delta_\pm^{-1}\Delta p_\pm + \mathcal{H}_\pm p_\pm^S$ and use lemma A.2 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
|p_\pm|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)} &\leq C\left(\rho_\pm|\operatorname{tr}(Dv_\pm)^2|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(\Omega_t)} + |p_\pm^S|_{H^{l-1}(\mathcal{S}_t)}\right)\\
&\leq C\rho_\pm|v_\pm|^2_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t)} + C\frac{\rho_-}{\rho_\mp}|\kappa_\pm|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} + C\rho_-\left(|N_\pm|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)}|v|^2_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t)}\right.\\
&+ \left.|v|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t)}|v|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)}|N_\pm|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)}\right) \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.2. *There exists a sequence $\{m_k\}$, a time $t^{\star\star}$ depending only on the initial data and an H^l–diffeomorphism $u_+ \in C_t^0\left([0,t^{\star\star}];H^l(\Omega_0^+)\right)$ with $\partial_t u_+ \in C_t^0\left([0,t^{\star\star}];H^{l'}(\Omega_0^+)\right)$ such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} u_+^{m_k} = u_+ \qquad \text{in} \quad C_t^0\left(\left([0,t^{\star\star}];H^l(\Omega_0^+)\right)\right) \tag{4.3}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \partial_t u_+^{m_k} = \partial_t u_+ \qquad \text{in} \quad C_t^0\left([0,t^{\star\star}];H^{l'}(\Omega_0^+)\right) \tag{4.4}$$

for any $l' < l$. Moreover if we define

$$\Omega_t^\infty := u_+(t,\Omega_0) \tag{4.5}$$

then there exists $v_+ \in L^\infty\left(H^l(\Omega_t^\infty)\right) \cap L^\infty\left(H^{l'}(\Omega_t^\infty)\right)$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} v_+^{m_k} \circ u_+^{m_k} = v_+ \circ u_+ \text{in} \quad C_t^0\left([0,t^{\star\star}];H^{l'}(\Omega_0^+)\right) \tag{4.6}$$

for any $l' < l$ and $p_+ \in L^\infty\left(H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)\right)$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} p_+^{m_k} \circ u_+^{m_k} = p_+ \circ u_+ \quad \text{weak–star in} \quad L^\infty\left([0,t^{\star\star}];H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_0^+)\right) \tag{4.7}$$

We will still denote these subsequences by the index m.

Proof Let us denote $X(H^s) = X([0,t^{\star\star}],H^s(\Omega_0^+))$ for $X = L^\infty$ or C_t^0 and C any positive constant depending only the initial data and the set Λ_0. Combining proposition 2.3 and corollary 2.5 we see that

$$|v^m|_{L^\infty(H^l(\Omega_t^{+,m}))} \leq C_0(1+E_m) \leq C$$

for any $t \leq t_0^\star$. Therefore, arguing as in the proof of proposition 2.3, we can find a positive time $t^{\star\star} \leq t_0^\star$ depending only on Λ_0 and the initial data, such that for any $0 \leq t \leq t^{\star\star}$

$$|u_+^m(t,\cdot) - \operatorname{id}_{\Omega_0^+}|_{H^l(\Omega_0^+)} \leq Ct^{\star\star} \leq \frac{1}{2}\,. \tag{4.8}$$

This show that each map u_+^m is an H^l–diffeomorphism onto its image and is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(H^l)$ by a constant depending only on the initial data and the set Λ_0. Then, up to extraction of a subsequence, there exist $u_+ \in L^\infty(H^l)$ such that $u_+^m \to u_+$ weak–star in $L^\infty(H^l)$. Lemma A.1 and (4.8) imply

$$|\partial_t u_+^m|_{H^l(\Omega_0^+)} \leq |v_+^m|_{H^l(\Omega_t^{+,m})} |u_+^m|^l_{H^l(\Omega_0^+)} \leq C\,.$$

Again by standard compactness we have, up to extraction, $\partial_t u_+^m = v_+^m \circ u_+^m \to \partial_t u_+ =: \bar v_+$ weak–star in $L^\infty(H^l)$. Since $u_+^m, u_+ \in W^{1,\infty}(H^l)$, we get $u_+ \in C^0_t(H^l)$ and[12] $u_+^m \to u_+$ in $C^0_t(H^l)$.
Passing to the limit in (4.8) we see that u_+ is also an H^l–diffeomorphism. Thus we can define v_+ by $v_+ \circ u_+ =: \bar v_+ = \partial_t u_+$. From Euler equations we have $\partial_t(v_+^m \circ u_+^m) = -\nabla p_+^m \circ u_+^m$ so that lemma 4.1, lemma A.1 and corollary 2.3 together with (A.10) imply

$$|\partial_t(v_+^m \circ u_+^m)|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_0^+)} \leq C|p_+^m|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t^{+,m})} \leq C\,.$$

In particular this gives continuity of $v_+^m \circ u_+^m = \partial_t u_+^m$ with values in $H^{l-1}(\Omega_0^+)$. It also implies the existence of a subsequence (still denoted by the index m) such that $\partial_t(v_+^m \circ u_+^m) \to \bar V_+$ weak–star in $L^\infty(H^{l-\frac{3}{2}})$. Since $v_+^m \circ u_+^m \to \bar v_+$ in the sense of distributions, $\bar V_+ = \partial_t \bar v_+$. Therefore[13] $\bar v_+ = v_+ \circ u_+ \in C^0_t(H^{l-1})$ and

$$v_+^m \circ u_+^m \to v_+ \circ u_+ \quad \text{in} \quad C^0_t\left(([0,t^{\star\star}]; H^{l-1}(\Omega_0^+))\right)\,.$$

As $v_+^m \circ u_+^m$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(H^l)$, by interpolating the Sobolev norms we can improve the above convergence obtaining (4.6) and the equivalent (4.4).
Finally, since $p_+^m \circ u_+^m$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(H^{l-\frac{1}{2}})$, up to extraction, we have $p_+^m \circ u_+^m \to \bar p_+$ weak–star in $L^\infty(H^{l-\frac{1}{2}})$ and (4.7) follows just by defining $p_+ =: \bar p_+ \circ u_+^{-1}$ □

4.2 Verification of (BC_0)

Using convergence of the Lagrangian maps u_+^m associated to v_+^m established in (4.3), we defined in (4.5) the "limit domain" Ω_t^∞ where the evolution of the limit solution is going to take place. From (4.3) and trace estimates we obtain $u_+^m|_{S_0} \longrightarrow u_+|_{S_0}$ in $C^0_t(H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(S_0))$ so that

$$u_+(t,S_0) = \partial u_+(t,\Omega_0^+) =: S_t^\infty \in C^0_t(H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad \text{for} \ \ t \in [0,t^{\star\star}]\,.$$

Proposition 4.3. *The moving boundary condition in* (BC_0) *holds for the set of hypersurfaces S_t^∞ with v_+ defined by* (4.6)*.*

Proof From the definition of Lagrangian maps, (4.4) and (4.6) we have

$$\partial_t u_+(t,y) = v_+(t,u_+(t,y)) \quad \forall\ (t,y) \in [0,t^{\star\star}] \times \Omega_0^+\,.$$

As $u_+(t,S_0) = S_t^\infty$ for any $t \in [0,t^{\star\star}]$, we have that $(t,u_+(t,\cdot))$ is a curve on the space–time boundary $\cup_t S_t^\infty$; therefore

$$\partial_t + \partial_t u_+ \cdot \nabla = \partial_t + v_+ \circ u_+ \cdot \nabla \text{ is tangent to } \bigcup_t S_t^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\,.$$

The fact that u_+ is a diffeomorphism from S_0 to S_t^∞ for any $t \in [0,t^{\star\star}]$ gives the claim □

Lemma 4.4. *Let $N_+^m(t,\cdot)$ be the outward unit normal and $\kappa_+^m(t,\cdot)$ the mean curvature of S_t^m. Denote by $N^\infty(t,x)$ and $\kappa^\infty(t,x)$ respectively the unit normal and the mean curvature of S_t^∞ at the point x. Then for any $l' < l$*

$$N_+^m \circ u_+^m \to N^\infty \circ u_+ \quad \textit{in } C^0_t(H^{l'}(S_0)) \quad \textit{and} \quad \kappa_+^m \circ u_+^m \to \kappa^\infty \circ u_+ \quad \textit{in } C^0_t(H^{l'-1}(S_0))\,. \tag{4.9}$$

In particular $|\kappa^\infty|_{H^{l'-1}(S_t^\infty)}$ is uniformly bounded which implies[14] *$S_t^\infty \in H^{l'+1}$ as stated in theorem 1.1.*

[12] The standard argument is the following. Consider an arbitrary subsequence of $\{u_+^m\}$; the boundedness of $\{\partial_t u_+^m\}$ implies through the Ascoli–Arzelá theorem the existence of a sub-subsequence converging in $C^0_t(H^l)$ to a limit which must be u_+ (the weak $\star$ limit of the original sequence $\{u_+^m\}$). Therefore u_+ is the uniform limit of $\{u_+^m\}$.

[13] We use the fact that $f \in L^2(H^{s_1})$ and $f_t \in L^2(H^{s_2})$ imply $f \in C(H^{(s_1+s_2)/2})$.

[14] This can be proved using local coordinates and estimates for quasi–linear elliptic equations. Another proof can be found in [14, proposition A.2].

Proof Since $\kappa^\infty(t,x)(X,Y) = \operatorname{tr}(Y\cdot\nabla_X N^\infty(t,x))$ for any $X,Y\in T_xS_t^\infty$, it is enough to prove the first statement in (4.9).
We use similar arguments to those in the proof of proposition 4.2. By lemma A.1, (A.10) and (2.3) we obtain uniform bounds on $N_+^m\circ u_+^m$ in $L^\infty(H^l)$; therefore there exists $\bar N_+\in L^\infty(H^l)$ such that, up to extraction of a subsequence, $N_+^m\circ u_+^m\to\bar N_+=:A^\infty\circ u_+$ weak–star in $L^\infty(H^l)$. Identity (A.6) and estimate (A.10) combined with the uniform energy bounds on κ_+^m show that

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}(N_+^m\circ u_+^m)\right|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(S_0)}\le C|v_+^m|_{H^l(\Omega_t^m)}|N_+^m|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(S_0)}\le C \tag{4.10}$$

with some C uniform in Λ_0 and m. This in particular implies that $N_+^m\circ u_+^m$ belongs to $C(H^{l-1}(S_0))$ and that, up to further extraction, $\partial_t(N_+^m\circ u_+^m)\to\partial_t(A^\infty\circ u_+)$ weak–star in $L^\infty H^{l-1}(S_0)$. As a consequence, $A^\infty\circ u_+\in C_t^0(H^{l-1}(S_0))$ and $N_+^m\circ u_+^m\to A^\infty\circ u_+$ in $C_t^0H^{l'}(S_0)$ for any $l'<l$.
To show that $A^\infty(t,\cdot)$ is the outward unit normal $N_+^\infty(t,\cdot)$ to the hypersurface S_t^∞ let $\tau^m\in T_xS_t^m$ be an arbitrary tangent vector. Since u_+^m is a diffeomorphism from S_0 to S_t^m, there exists a unique tangent vector $\tau_0\in T_yS_0$ such that $\tau_m=du_+^m(t,y)\tau_0$, where $du_+^m(t,y)$ denotes the differential of u_+^m as a map from S_0 to S_t^m acting on T_yS_0 for $y=(u_+^m)^{-1}(t,x)$. Then for any $t\in[0,t^{\star\star}]$

$$\langle\, N_+^m\left(t,u_+^m(t,y)\right),\, du_+^m(t,y)\,\tau_0\,\rangle=0$$

Letting m go to infinity using (4.3) we obtain

$$\langle\, A^\infty\left(t,u_+(t,y)\right),\, du_+(t,y)\,\tau_0\,\rangle=0$$

Since τ_m, and consequently τ_0, was arbitrarily chosen this implies that $A^\infty(t,x)\perp T_xS_t^\infty$ for $x=u_+(t,y)$; by the strong convergence established above A^∞ is unitary and therefore coincides with $N^\infty(t,x)$ □

Proposition 4.5. *The boundary condition* (BC_0) *for the pressure is satisfied by the limit solution.*

Proof For the sequence of solutions (v^m,S_t^m) condition (BC) holds for every $m\in\mathbb{N}$. As (E) is also satisfied for every m, the boundary condition for the physical pressure $p_\pm^m$ is the one given in (1.4) (where of course every quantity has to be indexed by m). Therefore $(p_+^m-\kappa_+^m)\circ u_+^m=p_-^m\circ u_+^m$ on S_0 and we can use lemma A.1, (4.2) and trace–estimates to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|(p_+^m-\kappa_+^m)\circ u_+^m|_{H^{l-1}(S_0)}&\le C|p_-^m|_{H^{l-\frac12}(\Omega_t^{-,m})}|u_+^m|^{l-\frac12}_{H^{l-\frac12}(\Omega_0)}\\ \le\quad C\rho_-^m&\left(|v_\pm^m|_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t^m)}+|\kappa_-^m|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)}+|v^m|^2_{H^{l-\frac12}(\Omega_t^m)}|N_\pm^m|_{H^{l-1}(S_t^m)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since the expression in parentheses above is uniformly bounded by the energies, letting $m\to\infty$ and using (4.9) we get

$$p_+^m\circ u_+^m\longrightarrow\kappa^\infty\circ u_+\quad\text{in } C_t^0H^{l'-1}(S_0) \tag{4.11}$$

for any $l'<l$. Using (4.7) we conclude that $p_+(t,x)=\kappa^\infty(t,x)$ for any $t\in[0,t^{\star\star}]$ and $x\in S_t^\infty$ □

4.3 Verification of (E_0)

We first need the following estimate:

Lemma 4.6. *Let p_+ be given by* (1.4) *then*

$$|\mathbf{D}_tp_+^m|_{L^\infty(H^{l-2}(\Omega_t^{+,m}))}\le C\,. \tag{4.12}$$

for some C uniform in m.

Proof In what follows we suppress the use of the index m and let $a\lesssim b$ denote $a\le Cb$ for some constant C independent of ρ_-. Writing $p_+=\mathcal{H}_+p_++\Delta^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2$ we have

$$\mathbf{D}_tp_+=\mathbf{D}_t\mathcal{H}_+p_++\mathbf{D}_t\Delta^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2=\mathcal{H}_+\mathbf{D}_tp_++\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{D}_t\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2+R:=\text{(I)}+\text{(II)}+R \tag{4.13}$$

where the remainder is given by the sum of the two commutators

$$R=R^1+R^2:=[\mathbf{D}_t,\mathcal{H}_+]\,p_++\left[\mathbf{D}_t,\Delta^{-1}\right]\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2. \tag{4.14}$$

We show that every term is bounded in H^{l-2} or better by the quantities $|v|_{H^l}$, $|p|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}}$, $|\kappa|_{H^{l-1}}$ and $|N|_{H^l}$ which are already known to be bounded uniformly in time by the energies independently of ρ_-.
Estimate of (I): This is the highest order term in (4.13). Denoting $P := \mathcal{N} p_+|_{S_t}$ we have

$$\text{(I)} = \mathcal{H}_+ \mathbf{D}_t \mathcal{N}^{-1} P = \mathcal{H}_+ \mathcal{N}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_t P + \mathcal{H}_+ R^3 P \quad \text{ with } \quad R^3 := \left[\mathcal{N}^{-1}, \mathbf{D}_t\right] .$$

Observe that $R^3 = \mathcal{N}^{-1}\left[\mathcal{N}, \mathbf{D}_t\right]\mathcal{N}^{-1}$ so that (A.3), (A.5) and (A.13) give

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{H}_+ R^3 P|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} &\lesssim \left|\left[\mathcal{N}^{-1}, \mathbf{D}_t\right] P\right|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} \lesssim \rho_- |v|_{H^l(\Omega_t)} |P|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} \\ &\lesssim |v|_{H^l(\Omega_t)} \left(|\kappa|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} + |v|^2_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)} |N|_{H^{l-1}(S_t)} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Using again (A.3) and (A.5) we obtain

$$|\mathcal{H}_+ \mathcal{N}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_t P|_{H^{l-2}(\Omega_t^+)} \leq C \rho_- |\mathbf{D}_t P|_{H^{l-\frac{7}{2}}(S_t)} . \tag{4.15}$$

Now $\mathbf{D}_t P$ contains four different terms to be estimated. The term involving the mean curvature is estimated by (A.13) and (A.7):

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{D}_t \frac{1}{\rho_-} \mathcal{N}_- \kappa_+|_{H^{l-\frac{7}{2}}(S_t)} &\lesssim \frac{1}{\rho_-} \left(|[\mathbf{D}_t, \mathcal{N}_-]\kappa_+|_{H^{l-\frac{7}{2}}(S_t)} + |\mathbf{D}_t \kappa_+|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)} \right) \\ \lesssim \quad \frac{C}{\rho_-} \left(|v|_{H^l(\Omega_t)} |\kappa_+|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)} + |v_+|_{H^l(\Omega_t^+)} |N_+|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)} + |\kappa_+|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)} |v_+|_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t^+)} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the presence of ρ_- in the denominator in this last estimate is compensated by the factor ρ_- in (4.15) so that the bounds remain uniform. For the terms involving $\operatorname{tr}(Dv)^2$ we use (A.6), (A.12) and the identities $\mathbf{D}_t \nabla f = \nabla \mathbf{D}_t f - (Dv)^\star \nabla f$ and[15] $\mathbf{D}_t \operatorname{tr}(Dv)^2 = -2 \operatorname{tr}\left[(Dv)^3 - 2\rho_+ D^2 p \cdot Dv\right]$ to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{D}_t \nabla_{N_\pm} \Delta_\pm^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(Dv_\pm)^2|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} \lesssim |\mathbf{D}_t N_\pm|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} |v|^2_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t)} + |N_\pm|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} |\mathbf{D}_t \nabla \Delta_\pm^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(Dv_\pm)^2|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t)} \\ \lesssim \quad & |N_\pm|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} |v|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)} |v|^2_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t)} + |N_\pm|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} \Big(|[\mathbf{D}_t, \Delta_\pm^{-1}] \operatorname{tr}(Dv_\pm)^2|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)} + |\mathbf{D}_t \operatorname{tr}(Dv_\pm)^2|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(\Omega_t)} \\ + \quad & |(Dv_\pm)^\star \nabla \Delta_\pm^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(Dv_\pm)^2|_{H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t)} \Big) \\ \lesssim \quad & |N_\pm|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} |v|^3_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)} + |N_\pm|_{H^{l-2}(S_t)} \Big(|v_\pm|_{H^l(\Omega_t)} |v_\pm|^2_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t)} + |v_\pm|^3_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t)} + |p_\pm|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)} |v|_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t)} \\ + \quad & |v_\pm|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t)} |v_\pm|^2_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t)} \Big) . \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, using (A.8) the terms $\mathbf{D}_t \Pi_\pm(v_\pm^\top, v_\pm^\top)$ and $\mathbf{D}_t(v_\pm^\top \nabla v_\pm^\perp)$ can be bounded uniformly in $H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)$ and $H^{l-3}(S_t)$ respectively.
Estimate of (II): By the same formula used above to express $\mathbf{D}_t \operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta^{-1} \mathbf{D}_t \operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} &\lesssim |(Dv_+)^3|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} + \rho_+ |D^2 p_+ \cdot Dv_+|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} \\ &\lesssim \left(|v_+|^3_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t^+)} + |p_+|_{H^{l-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} |v_+|_{H^{l-1}(\Omega_t^+)} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Estimate of R: Commutators R^1 and R^2 are estimated directly by (A.11) and (A.12):

$$|[\mathbf{D}_t, \mathcal{H}_+] p_+|_{H^{l-2}(\Omega_t^+)} \lesssim |v_+|_{H^l(\Omega_t^+)} |p_+|_{H^{l-\frac{5}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} \quad , \quad \left| [\mathbf{D}_t, \Delta^{-1}] \operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2 \right|_{H^l(\Omega_t^+)} \lesssim |v_+|^3_{H^l(\Omega_t^+)}$$

where as usual the constant C is independent of ρ_- □

[15] This identity follows from $\mathbf{D}_t Dv = D\mathbf{D}_t v - (Dv)^2$ together with Euler equations $\rho \mathbf{D}_t v = -\nabla p$.

Proposition 4.7. *Let v_+ and u_+ be given as in proposition 4.2 then*

$$\frac{d}{dt}(v_+^m \circ u_+^m) \longrightarrow \frac{d}{dt}(v_+ \circ u_+) \quad \textit{in } C_t^0(H^{l'-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_0^+))\,.$$

and v_+ satisfies Euler equations (E_0).

Proof (4.6) and the uniform bounds on p_+^m establish the above convergence weak–star in $L^\infty(H^{l-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_0^+))$. Since $\partial_t^2(v_+^m \circ u_+^m) = \mathbf{D}_t \nabla p_+^m \circ u_+^m = \nabla \mathbf{D}_t p_+^m \circ u_+^m - (Dv_+^m)^\star \nabla p_+^m \circ u_+^m$ the bound given in (4.12) implies $\partial_t^2(v_+^m \circ u_+^m) \in L^\infty(H^{l-3}(\Omega_0^+))$ and the desired strong convergence follows through the usual arguments.
From (4.7) and (4.11) we know that $p_+^m \circ u_+^m \to p_+ \circ u_+$ strongly in $C_t^0 H^{l'-\frac{1}{2}}$ and therefore $\nabla p_+^m \circ u_+^m = \nabla(p_+^m \circ u_+^m)(\nabla u_+^m)^{-1} \to \nabla p_+ \circ u_+$ in $C_t^0 H^{l-2}(\Omega_0^+)$. Since Euler equations in Lagrangian coordinates are $\partial_t(v_+^m \circ u_+^m) = -\nabla p_+^m \circ u_+^m$ we can take the limit in $L^\infty(H^{l-2}(\Omega_0^+))$ obtaining that v_+ satisfies Euler equations in Lagrangian coordinates too, i.e.

$$\frac{d}{dt} v_+(t, u_+(t,y)) = -\nabla p_+(t, u_+(t,y)) \qquad \forall\ (t,y) \in [0, t^{\star\star}] \times \Omega_0^+\,.$$

Finally from (4.3) and (4.6) we have $\nabla(v_+^m \circ u_+^m) \to \nabla(v_+ \circ u_+)$ in $C_t^0(H^{l-2}(\Omega_0^+))$ so that

$$0 \equiv \nabla \cdot v_+^m \circ u_+^m = \mathrm{tr}\,(\nabla v_+^m \circ u_+^m) = \mathrm{tr}\,\left(\nabla(v_+^m \circ u_+^m)(\nabla u_+^m)^{-1}\right) \overset{m\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \mathrm{tr}\,\left(\nabla(\bar v_+ \circ u_+)(\nabla u_+)^{-1}\right) = \nabla \cdot v_+ \circ u_+$$

which implies $\nabla \cdot v_+ = 0$ pointwise in Ω_t^∞ for any $t \in [0, t^{\star\star}]$ □

The proof of theorem 1.1 is completed ■

5 Proof of Proposition 1.2

Let Γ be the infinite–dimensional manifold (1.7) and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ its curvature tensor induced by the covariant differentiation defined in section 1.2. Consider a map $u(t) : \Omega_0 \to \Omega_t$ in Γ. Let $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^m$ denote the sectional curvature of Γ at the point u as an operator acting on $T_u\Gamma$ endowed with the $L^2(\rho^m dy)$ metric and depending on some $\bar v \in T_u\Gamma$ (and of course on u). We assume v and the hypersurfaces S_t to be sufficiently smooth and single out the leading order term of $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^m$ analyzing its behavior as m goes to infinity (or equivalently as the density ρ_- vanishes).
In view of the geometrical frame work discussed in section 1.2, and in particular in 1.2.3, $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^m$ can be considered as a measurement of the instability occurring in the linearized Euler equations in case surface tension were not present.
Let $\bar w$ be any vector in $\in T_u\Gamma$. We assume that w is uniformly bounded in $H^l(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)$ for some large enough l and compute the sectional curvature in the direction of $\bar v$ and $\bar w$. Using a well–known formula from Riemannian geometry together with (1.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{R}}^m &= \langle \bar{\mathcal{R}}(u)(\bar v, \bar w)\bar v\,,\ \bar w\rangle_{L^2(\rho^m dx)} = \langle II_u(\bar v, \bar v)\,,\ II_u(\bar w, \bar w)\rangle_{L^2(\rho^m dx)} - \|II_u(\bar v, \bar w)\|^2_{L^2(\rho^m dx)} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} \nabla p_{v,v} \nabla p_{w,w}\, \rho^m\, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} |\nabla p_{v,w}|^2\, \rho^m\, dx\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Again we suppress the use of the index m. Using the divergence theorem the first integral can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} \nabla p_{v,v} \nabla p_{w,w} \rho\, dx = \int_{S_t} p^S_{v,v} \left(\nabla_{N_+} p^+_{w,w} + \nabla_{N_-} p^-_{w,w}\right) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} p_{v,v} \Delta p_{w,w} \rho\, dx \\
= &\int_{S_t} p^S_{v,v} \left\{-2\nabla_{w_+^\top - w_-^\top} w_+^\perp + \Pi_+(w_+^\top, w_+^\top) + \Pi_-(w_-^\top, w_-^\top)\right\} dS + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} p_{v,v}\, \mathrm{tr}\,(Dw)^2\, \rho\, dx
\end{aligned}$$

having used $\nabla_{N_+} p^+_{w,w} + \nabla_{N_-} p^-_{w,w} = \mathcal{N} p^S_{v,v} + \nabla_{N_+} \Delta_+^{-1} \Delta p^+_{w,w} + \nabla_{N_-} \Delta_-^{-1} \Delta p^-_{w,w}$ and (1.13) with $v = w$. Since $tr(Dw)^2 = \partial_i w^k \partial_k w^i = \partial_i(w^k \partial_k w^i)$ we can use twice again the divergence theorem obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} \nabla p_{v,v} \nabla p_{w,w} \rho\, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} D^2 p_{v,v}(w,w)\, \rho\, dx + \int_{S_t} p^S_{v,v} \left\{-2\nabla_{w_+^\top - w_-^\top} w_+^\perp + \Pi_+(w_+^\top, w_+^\top) + \Pi_-(w_-^\top, w_-^\top)\right. \\
&+ \left. \nabla_{w_+} w_+ \cdot N_+ + \nabla_{w_-} w_- \cdot N_-\right\} dS - \int_{S_t} \rho_+ w_+^\perp \nabla_{w_+} p^+_{v,v} + \rho_- w_-^\perp \nabla_{w_-} p^-_{v,v}\, dS\,. \qquad (5.1)
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the terms containing $p^S_{v,w}$, which is the inverse image through $\mathcal{N}$ of a mean zero function on S_t, we use lemma A.2. For any $f \in L^1(S_t)$, (A.5) yields

$$\left| \int_{S_t} p^S_{v,w} f \, dS \right| \leq C |p^S_{v,w}|_{H^s(S_t)} |f|_{L_1(S_t)} \leq C\rho_- |\mathcal{N} p^S_{v,w}|_{H^{s-1}(S^t)} |f|_{L_1(S^t)}$$

whenever $s > \frac{n-1}{2}$, with C uniform in $S_t \in \Lambda_0$. Since $|\mathcal{N} p^S_{v,w}|_{H^{s-1}(S_t)}$ is uniformly bounded for smooth enough and bounded v and w, we can easily estimate several terms in (5.1):

$$\left| \int_{S_t} p^S_{v,v} \nabla_{w^\top_\pm} w^\perp_+ \, dS \right| \quad , \quad \left| \int_{S_t} p^S_{v,v} \Pi_\pm (w^\top_\pm, w^\top_\pm) \, dS \right| \quad , \quad \left| \int_{S_t} p^S_{v,v} \nabla_{w_\pm} w_\pm \cdot N_\pm \, dS \right| \leq C\rho_- |w|^2_{H^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)}$$

where C is some uniform constant depending on v and the mean curvature of S_t. These bounds imply

$$\lim_{\rho_- \to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} \nabla p_{v,v} \nabla p_{w,w} \rho \, dx = \int_{\Omega^+_t} D^2 p_{v_+,v_+}(w_+, w_+) \, \rho_+ \, dx - \lim_{\rho_- \to 0} \int_{S_t} \rho_+ w^\perp_+ \nabla_{w_+} p^+_{v,v} + \rho_- w^\perp_- \nabla_{w_-} p^-_{v,v} \, dS \, .$$

Next we look at the contribution of $\|II_u(\bar{v}, \bar{w})\|^2$, use the decomposition $f_\pm = \mathcal{H}_\pm f + \Delta^{-1}_\pm \Delta f$ applied to $p_{v,w}$ and observe that $\nabla \mathcal{H}_\pm \perp \nabla \Delta^{-1}_\pm \Delta$ to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} |\nabla p_{v,w}|^2 \rho \, dx = \int_{S_t} p^S_{v,w} \mathcal{N} p^S_{v,w} + \int_{\Omega^+_t} \left| \nabla \Delta^{-1}_+ \operatorname{tr}(DvDw) \right|^2 \rho_+ \, dx + \int_{\Omega^-_t} \left| \nabla \Delta^{-1}_- \operatorname{tr}(DvDw) \right|^2 \rho_- \, dx \, .$$

In [15] it is shown how the leading order term of the sectional curvature comes from the contribution of the surface integral in the above expression and is a second order negative semi–definite operator. But since $\mathcal{N} p^S_{v,w}$ is independent of ρ_-, by the same argument performed above the boundary integral vanishes as $\rho_- \to 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \to \infty} \bar{\mathcal{R}}^m &= \int_{\Omega^+_t} D^2 p_{v,v}(w,w) \, \rho_+ - \left| \nabla \Delta^{-1}_+ \operatorname{tr}(DvDw) \right|^2 \rho_+ \, dx \\ &- \lim_{\rho_- \to 0} \int_{S_t} \rho_+ w^\perp_+ \nabla_{w_+} p^+_{v,v} + \rho_- w^\perp_- \nabla_{w_-} p^-_{v,v} \, dS \, . \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

By splitting w into normal and tangential components on the boundary the surface integral in (5.2) is

$$\int_{S_t} \rho_+ w^\perp_+ \nabla_{w_+} p^+_{v,v} + \rho_- w^\perp_- \nabla_{w_-} p^-_{v,v} \, dS = \int_{S_t} \rho_+ |w^\perp_+|^2 \nabla_{N_+} p^+_{v,v} + \rho_- |w^\perp_-|^2 \nabla_{N_-} p^-_{v,v} \tag{5.3}$$

$$+ \int_{S_t} \rho_+ w^\perp_+ \nabla^\top_{w_+} p^+_{v,v} + \rho_- w^\perp_- \nabla^\top_{w_-} p^-_{v,v} \, dS \, . \tag{5.4}$$

Writing $\rho_\pm p^\pm_{v,v} = \mathcal{H}_\pm \left(p^S_{v,v} \right) - \rho_\pm \Delta^{-1}_\pm \operatorname{tr}(Dv)^2$, by the usual estimate for $p^S_{v,v}$ the right–hand side of (5.3) gives the contribution

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{S_t} |w^\perp_+|^2 \mathcal{N}_+ p^S_{v,v} + |w^\perp_-|^2 \mathcal{N}_- p^S_{v,v} + \rho_+ |w^\perp_+|^2 \nabla_{N_+} \Delta^{-1}_+ \operatorname{tr}(Dv)^2 + \rho_- |w^\perp_-|^2 \nabla_{N_-} \Delta^{-1}_- \operatorname{tr}(Dv)^2 \, dS \\ &\overset{\rho_- \to 0}{\longrightarrow} \int_{S_t} \rho_+ \nabla_{N_+} \Delta^{-1}_+ \operatorname{tr}(Dv)^2 |w^\perp_+|^2 \, dS \, . \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Since $\rho_+ p^+_{v,v} = \rho_- p^-_{v,v} = p^S_{v,v}$ on S_t and we are considering only tangential derivatives, the contribution of the term in (5.4) is

$$\left| \int_{S_t} w^\perp_+ \nabla_{w^\top_+ + w^\top_-} p^S_{v,v} \, dS \right| \leq C |w|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)} |p^S_{v,v}|_{H^{s_1}(S_t)} \leq C\rho_- |w|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)} \overset{\rho_- \to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0 \, . \tag{5.6}$$

Gathering (5.2), (5.3), (5.5) and (5.6) we get

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \left| \langle \bar{\mathcal{R}}^m(u)(\bar{v}, \bar{w}) \bar{v} \, , \, \bar{w} \rangle_{L^2(\rho^m \, dx)} + \int_{S_t} \rho_+ \nabla_{N_+} \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2 |w^\perp_+|^2 \, dS \right| \leq C |w|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)} \, . \tag{5.7}$$

This shows that the leading order term of the sectional curvature of Γ in the limit $\rho_- \to 0$ is given by the self–adjoint operator $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_0(v)$ acting on $T_{u_+}\Gamma$ represented in Lagrangian coordinates by

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}}_0(v_+) = \Big(-\rho_+ \nabla \mathcal{H}_+ \Big(\nabla_{N_+} \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2 (\cdot\,|_{\partial u_+(\Omega_0)})^\perp \Big) \Big) \circ u_+$$

and satisfying

$$\langle \bar{\mathcal{R}}_0(v_+)\bar{w}_+,\, \bar{w}_+ \rangle_{L^2(\rho_+ dy)} = -\int_{\partial u_+(\Omega_0)} \nabla_{N_+} \Delta^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2 |w_+^\perp|^2 \rho_+ \, dS\,. \tag{5.8}$$

From (1.12) we see that $\Delta^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2$ is exactly $p^\star_{v_+,v_+}$ for the water wave problem so that (5.8) is equivalent to the first integral in (1.19). Therefore we have shown that as $\rho_- \to 0$ the Kelvin–Helmotz instability for the vortex–sheet problem becomes the Raileigh–Taylor instability, i.e. the leading order term of the sectional curvature of Γ is not definite in general and has a positive sign only provided that the normal gradient of the physical pressure (in absence of surface tension) is negative. We conclude with two observations:

(i) If we do not restrict our attention exclusively to the highest order term of the sectional curvature operator, the above calculations show that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \langle \bar{\mathcal{R}}^m(u)(\bar{v},\bar{w})\bar{v}\,,\, \bar{w}\rangle_{L^2(\rho^m dy)} = -\int_{S_t} \rho_+ \nabla_{N_+}\Delta^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2 |w_+^\perp|^2 \, dS$$

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} D^2\Delta^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+)^2(w_+,w_+)\,\rho_+ - |\nabla\Delta^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(Dv_+Dw_+)|^2 \rho_+ \, dx\,.$$

Since the second fundamental form of $\Gamma^\star$ in the water wave problem is given by $\nabla p^\star_{v,w} = \nabla\Delta^{-1}\operatorname{tr}(DvDw)$ the above limit is exactly

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus S_t} \nabla p^\star_{v_+,v_+}\nabla p^\star_{w_+,w_+}\,\rho_+\,dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus S_t} |\nabla p^\star_{v_+,v_+}|^2\,\rho_+\,dx = \langle \bar{\mathcal{R}}^\star(u_+)(\bar{v}_+,\bar{w}_+)\bar{v}_+\,,\,\bar{w}_+\rangle_{L^2(\rho_+ dy)}.$$

(ii) From a standard argument we conclude that the full curvature tensor of Γ converges to the curvature tensor of $\Gamma^\star$ in the sense stated in (1.1) and this completes the proof of proposition 1.2 ■

A Supporting material for proofs

In this appendix we gather some technical results needed in the proofs presented and in the proof of theorem 2.4 in appendix B.

Lemma A.1. *Let D_i (resp. S_i) be domains (resp. hypersurfaces) in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $i = 0, 1$. Let $\eta : D_0 \to D_1$ (resp. $\eta : S_0 \to S_1$) be an H^l–diffeomorphism for $l > \frac{n}{2} + 1$ (resp. $l > \frac{n+1}{2}$) with $|(\det D\eta)^{-1}|_{L^\infty(D_1)} \le a$ (resp. $|(\det D\eta)^{-1}|_{L^\infty(S_1)} \le a$). Then the operator $T_\eta : f \to f\circ\eta$ is a bounded operator from $H^s(D_1)$ to $H^s(D_0)$ (resp. from $H^s(S_1)$ to $H^s(S_0)$) for any $s \in [0, l]$ and satisfies*

$$|f\circ\eta|_{H^s(D_0)} \le C_0 |f|_{H^s(D_1)} |\eta|^s_{H^l(D_0)} \tag{A.1}$$

for some constant C_0 depending on a, s, l and the domains D_i (resp. the hypersurfaces S_i).

Proof The case $s = 0$ follows immediately from the hypotheses. Assume by induction that (A.1) holds for any integer s such that $0 \le s \le k-1 \le l-1$. We prove the statement for $s = k$. Write $D^k(f\circ\eta) = D^{k-1}(Df\circ\eta\, D\eta) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} D^j(Df\circ\eta)D^{k-j}\eta$. Let $r \ge 2$ be the integer such that $\frac{n}{2} - 1 \le l - r < \frac{n}{2}$; observe that $D^i\eta \in L^\infty$ for $i \le r-1$ while it is not uniformly bounded in general for $i \ge r$ since H^{l-i} does not embed in L^∞. According to this we split

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} D^j(Df\circ\eta)D^{k-j}\eta = \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} D^j(Df\circ\eta)D^{k-j}\eta + \sum_{j=k-r+1}^{k-1} D^j(Df\circ\eta)D^{k-j}\eta =: \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2\,.$$

In Σ_2 all derivatives on η can be taken in L^∞ and estimated through Sobolev's embedding:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma_2|_{L^2(D_0)} &\le \sum_{j=k-r+1}^{k-1} |D^j(Df\circ\eta)|_{L^2(D_0)} |D^{k-j}\eta|_{L^\infty(D_0)} \le C|Df\circ\eta|_{H^{k-1}(D_0)}|\eta|_{H^l(D_0)} \\ &\le C|Df|_{H^{k-1}(D_1)}|\eta|^{k-1}_{H^l(D_0)}|\eta|_{H^l(D_0)} = C|f|_{H^k(D_1)}|\eta|^k_{H^l(D_0)}\,. \end{aligned}$$

The contribution of Σ_1 is estimated using Hölder's inequality and Sobolev's embeddings. Since $l > \frac{n}{2} + 1$ and $k - j \geq r > 1$, we can choose $2 < p, q < \infty$ such that

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2}\ , \quad \frac{1}{q} > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{l-k+j}{n}\ , \quad \frac{1}{p} > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{k-1-j}{n}\,.$$

Using Hölder's inequality and the embeddings $H^{l-k+j} \subset H^{(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})n} \subset L^q$, $H^{k-1-j} \subset H^{(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})n} \subset L^p$ we get

$$|\Sigma_1|_{L^2(D_0)} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} |D^j(Df\circ\eta)|_{L^p(D_0)} |D^{k-j}\eta|_{L^q(D_0)} \leq C|D^j(Df\circ\eta)|_{H^{k-1-j}(D_0)}|\eta|_{H^l(D_0)} \leq C|f|_{H^k(D_1)}|\eta|^k_{H^l(D_0)}$$

with C depending on a, k and the domains D_0, D_1. Therefore we proved

$$|D^k(f\circ\eta)|_{L^2(D_0)} \leq C|f|_{H^k(D_1)}|\eta|^k_{H^l(D_0)}$$

From the inductive hypothesis the same inequality holds for lower order derivatives terms $D^i(f\circ\eta)$, for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, replacing k with i. Up to further increasing the value of C depending on a and the constants in Sobolev's embeddings, we can sum this inequalities to obtain (A.1) for $s = k$. The case for non-integer s follows by interpolation □

Lemma A.2 (About differential operators on Λ_0 [14]). *Let Δ^{-1} and $\mathcal{H}$ denote respectively the inverse Laplacian with Dirichlet boundary condition and the Harmonic extension*[16] *operators on a domain Ω. There exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that for every domain Ω with $\partial\Omega = S \in \Lambda_0$ (see definition 2.1) the following is true:*

$$|f|_{\partial\Omega}|_{H^s(\partial\Omega)} \leq C|f|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)}\ , \quad \forall\ s > 0 \tag{A.2}$$

$$|\Delta^{-1}|_{L(H^{s-1}(\Omega),H^{s+1}(\Omega))} + |\mathcal{H}|_{L(H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega),H^{s+1}(\Omega))} \leq C\ , \quad \forall\ s \in (0, l-1]\,. \tag{A.3}$$

As a consequence the Dirichlet–to–Neumann operator satisfies[17]

$$|\mathcal{N}_0|_{L(H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega),H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))} + |\mathcal{N}_0^{-1}|_{L(\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega),\dot{H}^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))} \leq C\ , \quad \forall\ s \in [0, l-1]\,, \tag{A.4}$$

where $\dot{H}^s$ denotes zero–mean H^s–functions. In particular if $\mathcal{N}$ is the operator defined by (1.5) *then $|\mathcal{N}|_{L(H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega),H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))} \leq C(\rho_- + \rho_+)/(\rho_-\rho_+)$ and*

$$|\mathcal{N}^{-1}|_{L(\dot{H}^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega),\dot{H}^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))} \leq 2C\rho_-\ , \quad \forall\ s \in [0, l-1] \text{ and } \rho_- \leq \frac{\rho_+}{2C^2}\,. \tag{A.5}$$

Proof The proof of (A.2), (A.3), (A.4) and more detailed analysis of operators acting on $\partial\Omega$ (and in particular of the Dirichlet–to–Neumann operator) can be found in [14, A.2]. To obtain (A.5) write $\mathcal{N}$ as

$$\mathcal{N} = \left(\frac{\mathcal{N}_+}{\rho_+}\rho_-\mathcal{N}_-^{-1} + I\right)\frac{\mathcal{N}_-}{\rho_-} =: (B+I)\frac{\mathcal{N}_-}{\rho_-}\,.$$

Estimate (A.4) implies that for $\rho_- \leq \rho_+/(2C^2)$ the linear operator B maps $H^s(\partial\Omega)$ to itself with norm less or equal than $\frac{1}{2}$. Thus $I + B$ is invertible and $\mathcal{N}^{-1} = \rho_-\mathcal{N}_-^{-1}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(-1)^j B^j$ so that

$$|\mathcal{N}^{-1}|_{L(H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega),H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))} \leq \rho_- C\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}|B|^j_{L(H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega),H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega))} \leq 2C\rho_-\ \square$$

Lemma A.3 (Geometric Formulae [14]). *Let S be an hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^n$ moved by the normal component of a vector field v. Let N, κ and Π denote respectively its unit normal, mean curvature and second fundamental form. Then the following identities hold true:*

$$\mathbf{D}_t N = -[(Dv)^\star \cdot N]^\top \tag{A.6}$$

$$\mathbf{D}_t \kappa = -\Delta_{S_t} v^\perp - v^\perp|\Pi|^2 + \nabla_{v^\top}\kappa \tag{A.7}$$

$$\mathbf{D}_t^\top \Pi(\tau) = -\mathcal{D}_\tau\left(((Dv)^\star N)^\top\right) - \Pi\left((\nabla_\tau v)^\top\right) \tag{A.8}$$

$$-\Delta_S \Pi = -\mathcal{D}^2\kappa + (|\Pi|^2 I - \kappa\Pi)\Pi \tag{A.9}$$

[16] $F = \Delta^{-1}f$ satisfies $\Delta F = f$ in Ω and $F = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. $G = \mathcal{H}g$ satisfies $\Delta G = 0$ in Ω and $G = g$ on $\partial\Omega$.

[17] In view of (A.3) $\mathcal{N}_0$ can be defined for any $f \in H^s(\partial\Omega)$, $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$ in the weak form $\langle\varphi, \mathcal{N}_0(f)\rangle = \int_\Omega \nabla\mathcal{H}\varphi\nabla\mathcal{H}f$.

where $\mathcal{D}$ denotes the covariant derivative on S and $\Delta_S := tr\,\mathcal{D}^2$. Furthermore there exists a uniform constant C such that for any $S \in \Lambda_0$

$$|\Pi|_{H^s(S)} + |N|_{H^{s+1}(S)} \leq C(1 + |\kappa|_{H^s(S)}) \quad \forall\ l - \frac{5}{2} \leq s \leq l - 1\,. \tag{A.10}$$

Lemma A.4 (Commutator Estimates [14]). *There exists a uniform constant C such that for any $\partial\Omega = S \in \Lambda_0$ the following estimates hold:*

$$|[\mathbf{D}_t, \mathcal{H}]|_{L(H^{s-\frac{1}{2}}(S), H^s(S))} \leq C|v|_{H^l(\Omega)} \quad \forall\ \frac{1}{2} < s \leq l \tag{A.11}$$

$$\left|\left[\mathbf{D}_t, \Delta^{-1}\right]\right|_{L(H^{s-2}(\Omega), H^s(\Omega))} \leq C|v|_{H^l(\Omega)} \quad \forall\ 2 - l \leq s \leq l \tag{A.12}$$

$$|[\mathbf{D}_t, \mathcal{N}_0]|_{L(H^s(S), H^{s-1}(S))} \leq C|v|_{H^l(\Omega)} \quad \forall\ 1 \leq s \leq l - \frac{1}{2} \tag{A.13}$$

$$|[\mathbf{D}_t, \Delta_S]|_{L(H^s(S), H^{s-2}(S))} \leq C|v|_{H^l(\Omega)} \quad \forall\ \frac{7}{2} - l < s \leq l - \frac{1}{2}\,. \tag{A.14}$$

B Proof of Theorem 2.4

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.4 and consists essentially of material contained in [15, sec. 4.3, 4.4]. The only difference is that we claim and show independence of the energy estimates on the densities of the two fluids. Therefore, even though the proof is extremely similar to the one performed in [15], we present it here for the reader's convenience.

B.1 Estimates on the Lagrangian coordinate map

We use the same notation in the original proof of theorem 2.4 letting $l := \frac{3}{2}k$. Working on the compact domain Ω_t^+ and arguing as in the proof of proposition 2.3 (see section 3) we obtain the existence of a positive time t_1 and a constant C_1, only depending on k, n and μ as in (3.1) such that

$$|u_+(t,\cdot) - \mathrm{id}_{\Omega_0^+}|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k}(\Omega_0^+)} \leq C_1 t \quad \forall\ t \in [0, \min\{t_0, t_1\}]\,.$$

This implies the estimate on the mean curvature[18]

$$|\kappa_+(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)} \leq C_2 t + |\kappa_+(0,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{5}{2}}(S_0)} \quad \forall\ t \in [0, \min\{t_0, t_1\}]\,. \tag{B.1}$$

where the constant C_2 is only determined by μ and the set Λ_0. We conclude that there exists a time t_2 again determined only by μ and the set Λ_0 such that

$$S_t \in \Lambda_0 \quad , \quad \forall\ t \in [0, \min\{t_0, t_2\}]\,.$$

B.2 Evolution of the Energy

The energy defined in (2.1) is made of three terms. The first two involve the operator $\mathcal{A}$ defined in (1.18) and are used to control the irrotational part of the velocity and the mean curvature (hence the regularity of the evolving domain S_t); the third part involves the vorticity ω and is used to control the rotational part of v. More explicitly $E = E_1 + E_2 + |\omega|^2_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-1}}$ where, using (1.18), the first two terms are given by

$$E_1 := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} |\mathcal{A}^{\frac{k}{2}} v|^2 \rho\, dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_{S_t} v_+^{\perp}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}(-\Delta_{S_t})v_+^{\perp}\, dS \tag{B.2}$$

$$E_2 := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t} |\mathcal{A}^{\frac{k}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \nabla p_\kappa|^2 \rho\, dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_{S_t} \kappa_+ \bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}\kappa_+\, dS \tag{B.3}$$

where

$$\bar{\mathcal{N}} = \left(\frac{1}{\rho_+}\mathcal{N}\right)\mathcal{N}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\rho_-}\mathcal{N}\right)\,. \tag{B.4}$$

It is clear from lemma A.2 that $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$ is a first–order self–adjoint operator whose norm and inverse's norm do not depend on ρ_-.

[18] This can be checked using the local coordinates constructed in [14, appendix A].

Proposition B.1. *There exists a polynomial $Q(t) = Q\left(|v(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_t)},\, |\kappa(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-1}(S_t)}\right)$ with positive coefficients depending on the set Λ_0 and independent of the density ρ_- such that*

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}(E - E_{ex})\right| \leq Q \tag{B.5}$$

where the extra energy term E_{ex}, due to the Kelvin–Helmotz instability, is given by

$$E_{ex} = \frac{\rho_+}{2(\rho_+ + \rho_-)} \int_{S_t} \nabla_{v_+^\top} \kappa_+ \cdot \bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-2} \nabla_{v_+^\top} \kappa_+ \, dS - \frac{\rho_-}{2(\rho_+ + \rho_-)} \int_{S_t} \nabla_{v_-^\top} \kappa_+ \cdot \bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-2} \nabla_{v_-^\top} \kappa_+ \, dS\,. \tag{B.6}$$

Proof Throughout the proof we denote by Q any generic polynomial satisfying the properties in the statement.
Evolution of E_1: This is the hardest term to deal with and is the one where the extra energy term E_{ex} appears. We are going to show

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}\left(E_1 - E_{\text{ex}}\right) + \int_{S_t} v_+^\perp (-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^k \kappa_+ \, dS\right| \leq Q\,. \tag{B.7}$$

From definition (B.4) and (A.13) we have

$$\left|\left[\mathbf{D}_t, \bar{\mathcal{N}}\right]\right|_{L(H^s(S_t), H^{s-1}(S_t))} \leq C|v|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k}(\Omega_t)} \qquad \forall\ \frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq \frac{3}{2}k - \frac{1}{2}\,.$$

Therefore, using also (A.14), we can commute $\mathbf{D}_{t_+}$ with the operators appearing in (B.2) to get

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}\frac{1}{2}\int_{S_t} v_+^\perp (-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}(-\Delta_{S_t}) v_+^\perp \, dS - \int_{S_t} v_+^\perp (-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}(-\Delta_{S_t}) \mathbf{D}_{t_+} v_+^\perp \, dS\right| \leq Q\,.$$

Using (A.6) to express $\mathbf{D}_{t_+} N_+$, (1.16), (1.13) and (1.15) together with (B.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{D}_{t_+} v_+^\perp &= \mathbf{D}_{t_+} v_+ \cdot N_+ + v_+ \mathbf{D}_{t_+} N_+ = -\nabla_{N_+} p^+_{v,v} - \nabla_{N_+} p^+_\kappa - \nabla_{v_+^\top} v_+ \cdot N_+ \\
&= -\frac{1}{\rho_+}\mathcal{N}_+ p^S_{v,v} + \nabla_{N_+}\Delta_+^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(Dv)^2 - \bar{\mathcal{N}}\kappa_+ - \nabla_{v_+^\top} v_+^\perp + \Pi(v_+^\top, v_+^\top)
\end{aligned}$$

From lemma A.2 and trace–estimates $|\nabla_{N_+}\Delta_+^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(Dv)^2|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{1}{2}}(S_t)} \leq Q$ so that this term is lower order and

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_1 - \int_{S_t} v_+^\perp (-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}(-\Delta_{S_t})\left(-\frac{1}{\rho_+}\mathcal{N}_+ p^S_{v,v} - \bar{\mathcal{N}}\kappa_+ - \nabla_{v_+^\top} v_+^\perp + \Pi(v_+^\top, v_+^\top)\right) dS\right| \leq Q\,. \tag{B.8}$$

Equation (1.13) for $p^S_{v,v}$ gives

$$-\frac{1}{\rho_\pm}\mathcal{N}_+ p^S_{v,w} = -\frac{1}{\rho_\pm}\mathcal{N}_+\mathcal{N}^{-1}\left\{2\nabla_{v_+^\top - v_-^\top} v_+^\perp - \Pi_+(v_+^\top, v_+^\top) - \Pi_-(v_-^\top, v_-^\top) - \nabla_{N_+}\Delta_+^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(Dv)^2 - \nabla_{N_-}\Delta_-^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(Dv)^2\right\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{N}_+\mathcal{N}^{-1}$ is an operator of order zero the terms $\nabla_{N_\pm}\Delta_\pm^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(Dv)^2$ can be treated as before. From Lemma 4.6 in [15] (to which we refer for the proof)

$$\left|(-\Delta_{S_t})^{\frac{1}{2}} - \mathcal{N}_\pm\right|_{L(H^s(S_t))} \leq C\left(1 + |\kappa(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}(S_t)}}\right) \qquad \forall\ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}k \leq s \leq \frac{3}{2}k - \frac{1}{2}\,;$$

this and the definition (1.5) of $\mathcal{N}$ yield

$$\left|\mathcal{N}_+\mathcal{N}^{-1} - \frac{\rho_+\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\right|_{L\left(H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(S_t), H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{1}{2}}(S_t)\right)} \leq Q\,.$$

Together with (A.10) this gives

$$\left|-\frac{1}{\rho_+}\mathcal{N}_+ p^S_{v,v} - \frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\left(2\nabla_{v_+^\top - v_-^\top} v_+^\perp - \Pi_+(v_+^\top, v_+^\top) - \Pi_-(v_-^\top, v_-^\top)\right)\right|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{1}{2}}(S_t)} \leq Q$$

so that (B.8) becomes

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_1 \quad - \quad \int_{S_t} v_+^\perp(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}(-\Delta_{S_t})\left[-\frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\Pi_-(v_-^\top, v_-^\top) + \frac{\rho_+}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\Pi_+(v_+^\top, v_+^\top)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. - \quad \bar{\mathcal{N}}\kappa_+ + \nabla v_+^\perp\left(\frac{\rho_- - \rho_+}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}v_+^\top - \frac{2\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}v_-^\top\right)\right]\, dS\right| \leq Q\,.$$

We now claim that the last two terms in the above integral are lower order. To see this, consider flows $\Phi_\pm(\tau,\cdot)$ on Ω_t^+ generated by $\mathcal{H}_+ v_\pm^\top$ and apply (A.13) and (A.14) to $\mathbf{D}_\tau$ to move outside the tangential derivatives $\nabla_{v_\pm^\top}$:

$$\left|\int_{S_t} v_+^\perp(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}(-\Delta_{S_t})\nabla v_+^\perp\left(\frac{\rho_- - \rho_+}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}v_+^\top - \frac{2\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}v_-^\top\right)\, dS\right.$$
$$- \quad \frac{\rho_- - \rho_+}{2(\rho_+ + \rho_-)}\int_{S_t}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\left|(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{\frac{k-1}{2}}(-\Delta_{S_t})^{\frac{1}{2}}v_+^\perp\right|^2 dS$$
$$\left. + \quad \frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\int_{S_t}\nabla_{v_-^\top}\left|(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{\frac{k-1}{2}}(-\Delta_{S_t})^{\frac{1}{2}}v_+^\perp\right|^2 dS\right| \leq Q\,;$$

then integrate by parts in these last two integrals estimating $Dv_\pm^\top$ in $L^\infty(S_t)$ and the remaining $\frac{3}{2}k - \frac{1}{2}$ derivatives on $v_+^\perp$ in $L^2(S_t)$. For the terms involving the second fundamental form, (A.9) gives

$$\left|\Delta_{S_t}(\Pi_\pm(v_\pm^\top, v_\pm^\top) - \mathcal{D}^2 k_\pm(v_\pm^\top, v_\pm^\top)\right|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)} \leq Q\,.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}^2\kappa_\pm = \nabla_{v_\pm^\top}\nabla_{v_\pm^\top}\kappa_\pm - \mathcal{D}_{v_\pm^\top}v_\pm^\top\cdot\nabla\kappa_\pm$ and the last term in this sum is lower order, we get

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_1 - \int_{S_t} v_+^\perp(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}\left[\frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\nabla_{v_-^\top}\nabla_{v_-^\top}\kappa_- - \frac{\rho_+}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\kappa_+ + \Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}}\kappa_+\right]\, dS\right| \leq Q\,.$$

Using the same previous argument we can commute one of the factors $\nabla_{v_\pm^\top}$ and move it outside to obtain

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_1 \quad + \quad \frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\int_{S_t}\nabla_{v_-^\top}(-\Delta_{S_t}v_+^\perp)\bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-2}\nabla_{v_-^\top}\kappa_-\, dS \tag{B.9}$$
$$- \quad \frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\int_{S_t}\nabla_{v_+^\top}(-\Delta_{S_t}v_+^\perp)\bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-2}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\kappa_+\, dS \tag{B.10}$$
$$\left. + \quad \int_{S_t} v_+^\perp(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^k\kappa_+\, dS\right| \leq Q\,.$$

Now, thanks to identity (A.7)

$$\left|-\Delta_{S_t}v_+^\perp - \mathbf{D}_{t_+}\kappa_+\right|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-2}(S_t)} \leq Q$$

so that we can substitute $\mathbf{D}_{t_+}\kappa_+$ to $-\Delta_{S_t}v_+^\perp$ in (B.9) and (B.10). The usual commutator estimates imply

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_{\text{ex}} \quad + \quad \frac{\rho_-}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\int_{S_t}\nabla_{v_-^\top}\mathbf{D}_{t_+}\kappa_+\bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-2}\nabla_{v_-^\top}\kappa_-\, dS\right.$$
$$\left. - \quad \frac{\rho_+}{\rho_+ + \rho_-}\int_{S_t}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\mathbf{D}_{t_+}\kappa_+\bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-2}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\kappa_+\, dS\right| \leq Q$$

and (B.7) follows.

Evolution of E_2: As before commutator estimates (A.13) and (A.14) give

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_2 - \int_{S_t}\kappa_+\bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}\mathbf{D}_{t_+}\kappa_+\, dS\right| \leq Q$$

and in view of (A.7) and (A.10) we obtain

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_2 - \int_{S_t} \kappa_+ \bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}(-\Delta_{S_t})v_+^\perp \, dS\right| \leq Q + \left|\int_{S_t} \kappa_+ \bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\kappa_+ \, dS\right|$$

The same commutation argument previously adopted shows that

$$\left|\int_{S_t} \kappa_+ \bar{\mathcal{N}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{k-1}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\kappa_+ \, dS - \frac{1}{2}\int_{S_t} \nabla_{v_+^\top}\left|\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{\frac{k-1}{2}}\kappa_+\right|^2 dS\right| \leq Q\,.$$

Integrating by parts and estimating $Dv_+^\top$ in $L^\infty(S_t)$ and the remaining $\frac{3}{2}k-1$ derivatives on κ_+ in L^2 shows that this last integral is bounded by Q. Finally use the self–adjointness of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$ and Δ_{S_t} to obtain

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}E_2 - \int_{S_t} v_+^\perp(-\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^k\kappa_+ \, dS\right| \leq Q\,. \tag{B.11}$$

Evolution of the vorticity $\omega = Dv - (Dv)^\star$: Commuting repeatedly $\mathbf{D}_t$ with D and using the identity

$$\mathbf{D}_t\omega = D\mathbf{D}_t v - (Dv)^2 - (D\mathbf{D}_t v)^\star + ((Dv)^\star)^2 = ((Dv)^\star)^2 - (Dv)^2 = -\omega Dv - (Dv)^\star\omega$$

we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t} |D^{\frac{3}{2}k-1}\omega|^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t} \mathbf{D}_t|D^{\frac{3}{2}k-1}\omega|^2 \, dx \leq C|v(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t)}|\omega(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-1}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t)} \leq Q\,.$$

Summing up (B.7), (B.11) and (B.12) we get the desired cancellations giving (B.5) □

B.3 The Energy Inequality

Integrating in time (B.5) gives

$$E(t) - E(0) - E_{\text{ex}}(t) + E_{\text{ex}}(0) \leq \int_0^t Q\left(|v(s,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_s)},\, |\kappa(s,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-1}(S_s)}\right) ds \tag{B.12}$$

for any $0 \leq t \leq \min\{t_0, t_2\}$. We can estimate the extra energy term (B.6) by

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{\text{ex}}(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{2}\int_{S_t}\left|\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{\frac{k}{2}-1}\nabla_{v_+^\top}\kappa_+\right|^2 dS + \frac{1}{2}\int_{S_t}\left|\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Delta_{S_t}\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{\frac{k}{2}-1}\nabla_{v_-^\top}\kappa_+\right|^2 dS \\ &\leq C|v_\pm^\top\cdot\nabla\kappa_+|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{5}{2}}(S_t)} \leq C|v(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{5}{8}}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t)}\,|\kappa(t,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(S_t)} \end{aligned}$$

where the positive constant C depends only on the set Λ_0. Interpolating v between $H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}$ and $H^{\frac{3}{2}k}$ and κ between $H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{5}{2}}$ and $H^{\frac{3}{2}k-1}$ yields

$$|E_{\text{ex}}| \leq \frac{1}{2}E + C_1\left(1 + |v|^m_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t)}\right)$$

for some integer m where the constant C_1, which includes $|\kappa|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{5}{2}}}$, depends ultimately only on E_0 and Λ_0 in view of (B.1). Using Euler equations (1.16) and lemma 4.1 to estimate the pressure, we have

$$|\mathbf{D}_t v|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t)} = \frac{1}{\rho_+}|\nabla p_+|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t^+)} + \frac{1}{\rho_-}|\nabla p_-|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\Omega_t^-)} \leq Q\,.$$

We can then use the Lagrangian coordinate map to estimate

$$\left||v(t,\cdot)|^m_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_t)} - |v(0,\cdot)|^m_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_0)}\right| \leq \int_0^t Q(s)\,ds$$

and obtain

$$|E_{\text{ex}}| \leq \frac{1}{2}E + C_1\left(1 + |v(0,\cdot)|^m_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_0)}\right) + \int_0^t Q(s)\,ds \leq \frac{1}{2}E + C_2 + \int_0^t Q(s)\,ds$$

where C_2 is determined by E_0, the set Λ_0 and $|v(0,\cdot)|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}k-\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n\smallsetminus S_0)}$. Inserting this last inequality in (B.12) we finally obtain

$$E(S_t, v(t,\cdot)) \leq 3E(S_0, v(0,\cdot)) + C_2 + \int_0^t Q(s)\,ds$$

for some C_2 as above. Taking μ in (3.1) large enough compared to the initial data concludes the proof of theorem 2.4 ■

References

[1] D.M. Ambrose. Well-posedness of vortex sheets with surface tension. *SIAMJ. Math. Anal.*, 35(1):211–244, 2003.

[2] D.M. Ambrose and N. Masmoudi. Well-posedness of 3-d vortex sheets with surface tension. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 5(2):391–430, 2007.

[3] V.I. Arnold. Sur la géométrie differentielle des groups de Lie de dimension infinie et ses application à l'hydrodynamique des fluids parfait. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 16(1):319–361, July 1966.

[4] J.T. Beale, T.Y. Hou and J.S. Lowengrub. Growth rates for the linearized motion of fluid interfaces away from equilibrium. *Comm. on Pure Appl. Math.*, 46(9):1269–1301, 1993.

[5] Y. Brenier. Minimal geodesics on groups of volume-preserving maps and generalized solutions of the Euler equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 52(4):411–452, July 1999.

[6] A. Cheng, D. Coutand and S. Shkoller. On the motion of Vortex Sheets with surface tension. *Comm. on Pure and Appl. Math.*, 61(12):1715–1752, December 2008.

[7] A. Cheng, D. Coutand and S. Shkoller. On the limit as the density ratio tends to zero for two perfect incompressible 3-D fluids separated by a surface of discontinuity. *Preprint*, August 2009. Available on the web at http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/ shkoller/pub/pub.html.

[8] D. Christodoulou and H. Lindblad. On the motion of the free surface of a liquid. *Comm. on Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(12):1536–1602, 2000.

[9] D. Coutand and S. Shkoller. Well-posedness of the free-surface incompressible Euler equations with or without surface tension. *Journal of. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 20(3):829–930, July 2007.

[10] G. Ebin. The equations of motion of a perfect fluid with free boundary are not well posed. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 12(10):1175–1201, 1987.

[11] G. Ebin. Ill-posedness of the Raileigh-Taylor and Kelvin-Helmotz problems for incompressible fluids. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 13(10):1265–1295, 1988.

[12] G. Ebin and J. Marsden. Groups of Diffeomorphisms and the Motion of an Incompressible Fluid. *Annals of math*, 92(1):102–163, July 1970.

[13] H. Lindblad. Well-posedness for the motion of an incompressible liquid with free surface boundary. *Ann. of Math.*, 162(1):109–194, 2005.

[14] J. Shatah and C. Zeng. Geometry and a priori estimates for free boundary problems of the Euler equation. *Comm. on pure and appl. math*, 61(5):698–744, May 2008.

[15] J. Shatah and C. Zeng. A priori estimates for fluid interface problems. *Comm. on pure and appl. math*, 61(6):848–876, June 2008.

[16] J. Shatah and C. Zeng. Local well-posedness for the fluid interface problem. *Preprint*, 2009.

[17] A. Shnirelman. The geometry of the group of diffeomorphisms and the dynamics of an ideal incompressible fluid. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 128(1):82–109, 144, July 1985.

[18] S. Wu. Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 2-d. *Invent. math*, 130(1):39–72, 1997.

[19] S. Wu. Well-posedness in Sobolev spaces of the full water wave problem in 3-d. *J. Amer. Math Society math*, 12(2):445–495, 1999.